

Cc: Kate Guyton[GuytonK@iarc.fr]
To: Isabelle Baldi[Isabelle.Baldi@isped.u-bordeaux2.fr]; Aaron Blair[blaira@exchange.nih.gov]; GMC24@columbia.edu[GMC24@columbia.edu]; Egeghy, Peter[Egeghy.Peter@epa.gov]; Forastiere, Francesco[f.forastiere@deplazio.it]; Lin Fritschi[lin.fritschi@curtin.edu.au]; Jahnke, Gloria (NIH/NIEHS) [E][jahnke@niehs.nih.gov]; [REDACTED] Kromhout, J. (Hans)[h.kromhout@uu.nl]; Frank Iecurieux[frank.iecurieux@echa.europa.eu]; Martin, Matt[Martin.Matt@epa.gov]; John McLaughlin[John.McLaughlin@oahpp.ca]; [REDACTED] Matthew Ross[MRoss@cvm.msstate.edu]; Rusyn, Ivan[I.Rusyn@cvm.tamu.edu]; [REDACTED] Mannetje, Andrea[A.Mannetje@massey.ac.nz]; [REDACTED]
From: Chris Portier
Sent: Tue 11/10/2015 3:53:03 PM
Subject: IARC Monograph vol 112- EFSA Review of Glyphosate

Dear IARC V 112 Working Group Members,

I want to thank those of you who have gotten back to me with suggestions and a decision on whether to sign onto this letter. After much discussion with several colleagues, it seems best to me that rather than developing a letter from the WG, we develop a letter from many different scientists expressing concern about the differences between the BfR Addendum and the IARC WG report and questioning the scientific quality of the BfR Addendum. Thus, I have rewritten the document with many of your suggestions and with a tone that now reflects a letter from a group of concerned scientists. I will be sending this out shortly to a large list of folks, you included, to see if I can get sufficient buy-in to publish the letter. Thank you for your help up to this point.

C.